

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-3 and 7-15 have been amended and claims 16-20 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 8 and 16 are independent claims.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Claim Objection

In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 9 was objected to for several informalities. This objection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to correct the informalities pointed out by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submits that claims 1 and 9, as amended, overcomes the stated objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Further, although the Examiner has not pointed out, claims 1 and 9 have been further amended and claims 2, 3, 7, 8 and 10-15 have been amended for the sole purposes of clarification, informality correction and better wording. This amendment is not made for the purpose of avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention, and no change in claim scope is intended. Therefore Applicants do not intend to relinquish any subject matter by these amendments.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 1 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In the Office Action, the Examiner stated “The limitation “polymer barrier” recited in claims 1 and 8 is not fully disclosed in the specification”. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In this response, claims 1 and 8 have been amended to replace “a polymer barrier” with -- a polymer region--. An example of the polymer region is described in the specification. For example, “the monomers in the liquid crystal layer 91 are aggregated toward the opening pattern 21 due to the UV light, and transit the phase to form a polymer 921 while leaving only small amount of monomers on the pixel electrode 21” (Specification, page 8, lines 1-4). Thus, the specification clearly discloses a polymer region formed in the liquid crystal layer.

Thus, claims 1 and 8 has been amended for clarification. This amendment is not made for the purpose of avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention, and no change in claim scope is intended. Therefore, Applicants do not intend to relinquish any subject matter by these amendments. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 8, as amended, fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection of claims 1 and 8.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-8, 10, 11 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent Publication No. 2001/007487 by Yoon, *et al.* (“Yoon”). Applicants respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites “a liquid crystal layer sandwiched between the first and the second substrates, the liquid crystal layer having a polymer region”. An example of this claimed feature is shown in FIG. 2 of the present application, in which “a polymer 921 is provided at the liquid crystal layer 91 between the opening pattern 211 of the pixel electrode 21 and the groove 711 of the color filter 71” (Specification, page 5, lines 19-22).

In this regard, the Examiner asserted that Yoon discloses this claimed feature. This assertion is respectfully disagreed with. Yoon is directed to a common electrode having depression patterns, of which the side walls are at an angle of 30-120°. However, Yoon does not disclose or suggest “a liquid crystal layer sandwiched between the first and the second substrates, the liquid crystal layer having a polymer region”. This is further evidenced by the fact that the Office Action is absolutely silent as to how and where in Yoon discloses or suggests this claimed feature. Thus, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Yoon.

Independent claim 8 recites “filling liquid crystal between the first substrate and the second substrate to form a liquid crystal layer; and forming a polymer region in the liquid crystal layer”. As previously mentioned, Yoon fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature. Thus, it is submitted that claim 8 is patentable over Yoon. Claims 2-7, 11 and 13-15 that are dependent from claims 1 and 8 would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 1-8, 10, 11 and 13-15.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 8, 10, 11 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,084,650 by Sekiguchi (“Sekiguchi”). Applicants respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites “a liquid crystal layer sandwiched between the first and the second substrates, the liquid crystal layer having a polymer region”. In this regard, the Examiner asserted that Sekiguchi discloses this claimed feature. This assertion is respectfully disagreed with.

Sekiguchi is directed to light transmitting portions provided around the color filters or reflecting films in each pixel region to enhance light transmission for increased brightness. However, Sekiguchi does not disclose or suggest “a liquid crystal layer sandwiched between the first and the second substrates, the liquid crystal layer having a polymer region”. This is further evidenced by the fact that the Office Action fails to point out where in Sekiguchi discloses or suggests this claimed feature. Thus, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Sekiguchi.

Independent claim 8 recites “filling liquid crystal between the first substrate and the second substrate to form a liquid crystal layer; and forming a polymer region in the liquid crystal layer”. As previously mentioned, Sekiguchi fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature. Thus, it is submitted that independent claim 8 is patentable over Sekiguchi. Claims 10, 11 and 13-15 that are dependent from claim 8 would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 1-8, 10, 11 and 13-15.

Added Claims

In this response, claims 16-20 have been amended to claim the invention from different perspectives.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: October 17, 2003

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:WSC/kbs

\\COM\226706.1